

Environmental Checklist Form (Initial Study)
County of Los Angeles, Department of Regional Planning



Project title: "Four Aces Movie Location" / Project No. R2014-00920/ Case No(s). (RENV 201400085, RCUP 201400043

Lead agency name and address: Los Angeles County, 320 West Temple Street, Room 1360, Los Angeles, CA 90012

Contact Person and phone number: Richard Claghorn, (213) 974-6443

Project sponsor's name and address: Jan-Peter Flack, 2522 32nd Street, Santa Monica, CA 90405

Project location: 14499 E. Avenue Q, Palmdale, CA 93591

APN: 3029-010-009 USGS Quad: Lovejoy Buttes

Gross Acreage: 6.15 acres

General plan designation: See Community/Area wide Plan designation

Community/Area wide Plan designation: Rural Land 20 (Antelope Valley Area Plan)

Zoning: A-2-2 (Heavy Agriculture, two acre minimum lot size)

Description of project: The project is a permanent movie set. It includes interconnected sets made to appear as a motel, diner, and gas station, including interiors. The use was established in 1998 or shortly before. In 1998, a CUP was filed to legalize the use, but the permit was denied for inactivity in 2002. The movie set has remained, however. This CUP was filed to legalize the use. The majority of the property is undisturbed and no new development activity is proposed. The developed/disturbed area of the property covers 0.7 acres of the 6.15 acre site.

Surrounding land uses and setting: The site is nearly flat with no notable topographic relief other than a sand berm constructed for flood control purposes near Big Rock Wash at the southwest corner of the site. Most of the site is Joshua Tree Woodland habitat. It is a rural desert location surrounded by vacant undeveloped parcels. There are some scattered single-family homes in the surrounding area, but it remains predominantly open desert land. The entire subject parcel is within a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). Nearly the entire site is in the Big Rock Wash SEA (SEA #48). A very small area at the northeast corner, approximately 150 square feet in size, falls within the Lovejoy Butte SEA (SEA #53).

Other public agencies whose approval may be required (e.g., permits, financing approval, or participation agreement):

<i>Public Agency</i>	<i>Approval Required</i>
----------------------	--------------------------

<u>LA County Public Works</u>	<u>Building permits</u>
-------------------------------	-------------------------

<u>LA County Fire Department</u>	<u>Fire protection</u>
----------------------------------	------------------------

Major projects in the area:

Project/Case No.

Description and Status

No major projects

DRAFT

Reviewing Agencies:*Responsible Agencies*☒ None

Regional Water Quality Control

Board:

☐ Los Angeles Region☐ Lahontan Region☐ Coastal Commission☐ Army Corps of Engineers☐ US Fish & Wildlife*Special Reviewing Agencies*☐ None☐ Santa Monica Mountains
Conservancy☐ National Parks☐ National Forest☐ Edwards Air Force Base☐ Resource Conservation
District of Santa Monica
Mountains Area☒ Native American Heritage
Commission☒ San Manuel Band of Mission
Indians☒ Fernandeno Tataviam Band
of Mission Indians*Regional Significance*☒ None☐ SCAG Criteria☐ Air Quality☐ Water Resources☐ Santa Monica Mtns. Area*Trustee Agencies*☐ None☒ State Fish and Wildlife☐ State Parks and Recreation☐ State Lands Commission☐ University of California
(Natural Land and Water
Reserves System)*County Reviewing Agencies*☒ DPW:- Land Development Division
(Grading & Drainage)- Geotechnical & Materials
Engineering Division- Watershed Management
Division (NPDES)

- Traffic and Lighting Division

- Environmental Programs
Division

- Waterworks Division

☒ Fire Department- Forestry, Environmental
Division

- Planning Division

- Land Development Unit

- Health Hazmat

☐ Sanitation District☒ Public Health/Environmental
Health Division: Land Use
Program (OWTS)☐ Sheriff Department☐ Parks and Recreation☐ Subdivision Committee☐ County Library

ENVIRONMENTAL FACTORS POTENTIALLY AFFECTED:

The environmental factors checked below (x) would be potentially affected by this project.

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Aesthetics | <input type="checkbox"/> Greenhouse Gas Emissions | <input type="checkbox"/> Population/Housing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Agriculture/Forest | <input type="checkbox"/> Hazards/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> Public Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Air Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Hydrology/Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Recreation |
| X Biological Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Land Use/Planning | <input type="checkbox"/> Transportation/Traffic |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Mineral Resources | <input type="checkbox"/> Utilities/Services |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Energy | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Mandatory Findings
of Significance |
| X Geology/Soils | | |

DETERMINATION: (To be completed by the Lead Department.)

On the basis of this initial evaluation:

- ☐ I find that the proposed project COULD NOT have a significant effect on the environment, and a NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☒ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, there will not be a significant effect in this case because revisions in the project have been made by or agreed to by the project proponent. A MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION will be prepared.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a significant effect on the environment, and an ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required.
- ☐ I find that the proposed project MAY have a "potentially significant impact" or "potentially significant unless mitigated" impact on the environment, but at least one effect 1) has been adequately analyzed in an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and 2) has been addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis as described on attached sheets. An ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT REPORT is required, but it must analyze only the effects that remain to be addressed.
- ☐ I find that although the proposed project could have a significant effect on the environment, because all potentially significant effects (a) have been analyzed adequately in an earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION pursuant to applicable standards, and (b) have been avoided or mitigated pursuant to that earlier EIR or NEGATIVE DECLARATION, including revisions or mitigation measures that are imposed upon the proposed project, nothing further is required.



Signature (Prepared by)

10-22-15

Date

Signature (Approved by)

Date

EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

- 1) A brief explanation is required for all answers except "No Impact" answers that are adequately supported by the information sources the Lead Department cites in the parentheses following each question. A "No Impact" answer is adequately supported if the referenced information sources show that the impact simply does not apply to projects like the one involved (e.g., the project falls outside a fault rupture zone). A "No Impact" answer should be explained where it is based on project-specific factors as well as general standards (e.g., the project will not expose sensitive receptors to pollutants, based on a project-specific screening analysis).
- 2) All answers must take account of the whole action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts.
- 3) Once the Lead Department has determined that a particular physical impact may occur, then the checklist answers must indicate whether the impact is potentially significant, less than significant with mitigation, or less than significant. "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- 4) "Negative Declaration: Less Than Significant With Mitigation Incorporated" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less Than Significant Impact." The lead agency must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less than significant level. (Mitigation measures from Section XVII, "Earlier Analyses," may be cross-referenced.)
- 5) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, program EIR, or other CEQA processes, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or negative declaration. (State CEQA Guidelines § 15063(c)(3)(D).) In this case, a brief discussion should identify the following:
 - a) Earlier Analysis Used. Identify and state where they are available for review.
 - b) Impacts Adequately Addressed. Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards, and state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - c) Mitigation Measures. For effects that are "Less than Significant with Mitigation Measures Incorporated," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- 6) Supporting Information Sources: A source list should be attached, and other sources used or individuals contacted should be cited in the discussion.
- 7) The explanation of each issue should identify: the significance threshold, if any, used to evaluate each question, and; mitigation measures identified, if any, to reduce the impact to less than significance. Sources of thresholds include the County General Plan, other County planning documents, and County ordinances. Some thresholds are unique to geographical locations.
- 8) Climate Change Impacts: When determining whether a project's impacts are significant, the analysis should consider, when relevant, the effects of future climate change on : 1) worsening hazardous conditions that pose risks to the project's inhabitants and structures (e.g., floods and wildfires), and 2)

worsening the project's impacts on the environment (e.g., impacts on special status species and public health).

DRAFT

1. AESTHETICS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The movie set does not significantly affect existing scenic vistas in the area. The nearest officially mapped scenic resource is a Scenic Highway Corridor (170th St. East) approximately 2.5 miles to the east, as shown on the Hazards and Resources map of the Antelope Valley Area Plan.

b) Be visible from or obstruct views from a regional riding or hiking trail? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The GIS-Net 3 map depicts two trails in the area. The San Bernardino Connector Trail runs along Avenue Q at the southern end of the property adjacent to the movie set according to this map. No physical trail currently exists at the location, although it appears on the GIS map. The Los Angeles County Department of Parks and Recreation will require recordation of a trail easement for the connector trail along the north side of Avenue Q as a condition of CUP approval. No change is proposed in the views on the property. The movie set use has existed since at least 1998, and the views will not change as a result of this proposal. The Big Rock Creek Trail is located approximately 800 feet west of the subject property. The sand berms along Big Rock Wash obscure the view from Big Rock Creek Trail.

c) Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings within a state scenic highway? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The property does not include any historic buildings nor is it visible from a state scenic highway. The property contains no trees except Joshua trees, and no Joshua trees shall be damaged. One Joshua tree was reportedly removed in approximately 1998 when the movie set was established, but it was reportedly in poor condition. There are no prominent rock outcroppings in the vicinity of the movie set location. No Joshua trees are proposed for removal. The movie set will not significantly damage any scenic resources. The property has been used for illegal dumping, which has damaged scenic resources. The subject property owner regularly cleans up the trash on the site left by illegal trash dumpers.

d) Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings because of height, bulk, pattern, scale, character, or other features? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No change is proposed and the visual character of the site will not be altered. The movie set use was established in 1998, at which time the impacts to the site occurred. No permits were obtained for this use, although a CUP was applied for in 1998 (CUP 98-060). It was denied for inactivity in 2002, although the use remained. Although the site appears to be a commercial site with a motel, gas station, and diner, it is only a movie set, and no new significant visual impacts shall occur as a result of the project. There are no existing similar uses in the area.

e) Create a new source of substantial shadows, light, or glare which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area?

☐☐☒☐

There will be no new sources of substantial shadows, light, or glare. Nighttime filming is expected to occur, but it will be limited to the film set area and will be designed so as to avoid illumination and glare in the areas of the site and surrounding properties remaining in a natural condition, and which contain sensitive species. The site is within the Rural Outdoor Lighting District and is therefore subject to the "Dark Skies" requirements of Title 22.

DRAFT

2. AGRICULTURE / FOREST

In determining whether impacts to agricultural resources are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to the California Agricultural Land Evaluation and Site Assessment Model (1997) prepared by the California Department of Conservation as an optional model to use in assessing impacts on agriculture and farmland. In determining whether impacts to forest resources, including timberland, are significant environmental effects, lead agencies may refer to information compiled by the California Department of Forestry and Fire Protection regarding the state's inventory of forest land, including the Forest and Range Assessment Project and the Forest Legacy Assessment project; and forest carbon measurement methodology provided in Forest Protocols adopted by the California Air Resources Board.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

The subject property does not contain any land mapped as prime farmland or unique farmland on the Los Angeles Important Farmland map dated 2012 produced by the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Department of Conservation.

b) Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, with a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area, or with a Williamson Act contract?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The subject property is zoned A-2-1 (Heavy Agriculture – One Acre Minimum Required Lot Area), and this zone allows motion picture sets as a conditional use. It is consistent with the zoning. The property is not in a designated Agricultural Opportunity Area nor does a Williamson Act contract exist on the parcel.

c) Conflict with existing zoning for, or cause rezoning of, forest land (as defined in Public Resources Code § 12220 (g)), timberland (as defined in Public Resources Code § 4526), or timberland zoned Timberland Production (as defined in Government Code § 51104(g))?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The subject property is not zoned as forest land or timberland and no rezoning is proposed.

d) Result in the loss of forest land or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No forest land will be lost as a result of the project. One Joshua tree in poor condition was reportedly removed in 1998 when the movie set was established. The majority of the property, 5.45 acres of the total 6.15 acres, shall remain as natural desert vegetation, which includes many Joshua trees as well as a variety of other native desert vegetation. No changes are proposed in the existing site conditions.

e) Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland, to non-agricultural use or conversion of forest land to non-forest use?

☐☐☒☐

The parcel is zoned for agricultural use, although no agricultural uses are known to have occurred on the parcel. The parcel is too arid to support agricultural uses without irrigation and is not suited to agricultural uses because it is in a Significant Ecological Area. No changes are proposed in the existing use.

DRAFT

3. AIR QUALITY

Where available, the significance criteria established by the applicable air quality management or air pollution control district may be relied upon to make the following determinations.

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Conflict with or obstruct implementation of applicable air quality plans of either the South Coast AQMD (SCAQMD) or the Antelope Valley AQMD (AVAQMD)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project will comply with the applicable air quality plans of the AVAQMD. Any emissions related to the movie set use are very minimal.

b) Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The existing use is proposed to remain. The existing impacts to air quality are very low and will not change. Vehicles and equipment for filming are used on the site, but the number of vehicles driving to the property is very small and will remain at current levels. There will be no disturbance of the soil or other factors which might potentially cause dust problems or any air quality violation.

c) Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The emissions will be well below SCAQMD significance thresholds for operation, and there is no proposed construction. The project will not contribute to a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria pollutant.

d) Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

There are no sensitive receptors, such as schools or hospitals, or substantial pollutant concentrations in the vicinity. The proposed movie set is located in a Significant Ecological Area (SEA), but due to the low level of air pollutants to be generated by the project, which are well below AVAQMD significance thresholds, any potential impacts to the SEA would be less than significant.

e) Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No objectionable odors are expected to occur. No farm animals are proposed and no substances with strong odors are proposed or anticipated to be used on the property.

DRAFT

4. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	------------------

Would the project:

a) Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies, or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)?

☐
☒
☐
☐

Based on the Biological Constraints Analysis (BCA) prepared by Envicom and updated in October 2014, there were no special-status plant species detected within the subject property during site visits in January 1999 and February 2014. A total of 76 different species of vascular plants were observed during Envicom's January 1999 and February 2014 surveys. A small white-flowered plant was detected during the February 2014 field survey, which was not positively identified, but which could be a white pygmy-poppy, (*Canbya candida*), an annual herb. This species is classified by the California Native Plant Society as fairly threatened in California (California Rare Plant Rank 4, a watch list for plants that are of limited distribution in California, and threat rank 0.2, moderate degree and immediacy of threat). It is considered as potentially present on the site with moderate probability. However, this plant could not be relocated for identification. Based on additional observations, Envicom believes the small white-flowered plant observed during the site visit was most likely a very small and early blooming club-fruited evening primrose (*Chylismia claviformis*). An evaluation of the potential for occurrence of special-status plant species on the site was included in the BCA. One special-status plant species, Alkali mariposa lily (*Calochortus striatus*) was listed as potentially occurring on the site and three others were listed as having a very low probability to occur (*Eriophyllum mohavense*, *Plagiobothrys parishii*, and *Eriastrum rosamondense*). The others were listed as having no potential for occurrence. The DRP Staff Biologist made a site visit on February 25, 2014 and observed no special-status plant or wildlife species. One special-status wildlife species was directly observed during a site visit in February 2014 by Envicom. It was a loggerhead shrike (*Lanius ludovicianus*) seen on the adjacent parcel to the east. This species undoubtedly occurs at the project site as well. Envicom also observed a very old desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*) burrow in January 1999 during a site visit for an earlier BCA report with the previous CUP application. The 2014 BCA identified 18 special-status animals, including one reptile, eight birds, and nine mammals, with potential to occur at the site with varying probabilities from moderate to very low. Of these species, three are listed under the Federal Endangered Species Act (FESA) or California Endangered Species Act (CESA), including the desert tortoise (*Gopherus agassizii*), the Mohave ground squirrel (*Xerospermophilus mohavensis*), and Swainson's hawk (*Buteo swainsoni*). An additional seven non-listed special-status bird species that are Species of Special Concern or California Fully Protected species may potentially occur at the site. Up to eight special-status mammals that are Species of Special Concern may potentially occur at the site, with varying probabilities from low to high.

The BCA divided the subject property into areas of high biological value and low biological value. The high biological value area corresponds to the undeveloped area while the low biological value area corresponds to the developed area near the southeast corner where the movie set is located and the land is cleared and highly disturbed. The area of high biological value includes the Big Rock Wash channel and berm at the southwest

corner of the site and an unpaved road and trail area near the north end of the parcel, but the area of high biological value is otherwise relatively undisturbed. No further development or activity is proposed in the area of high biological value. A fence separates the movie set area from the rest of the site, and filming activity and parking shall be restricted to the area that is of low biological value near the southeast corner of the site. No activities are proposed in the high biological value area of the parcel, and activities in the movie set area will be restricted by conditions to avoid impacting the areas of high biological value. Such restrictions shall include requiring that trash be properly disposed of in predator-proof containers, providing proper fencing to delineate and protect the sensitive areas, signage to warn of the sensitive nature of the site and to inform the public of prohibited activities and sensitive areas, prohibiting the encroachment of personnel, vehicles, and pets into sensitive habitats, prohibiting light trespass, glare, and excessive noise during nighttime hours, and providing educational handouts to key personnel working at or visiting the site to inform them of the sensitive nature of the site and the need for extra care to be taken to protect sensitive biological resources. These mitigation measures were proposed by Envicom's biologist and accepted by the county biologist and by the Significant Ecological Area Technical Advisory Committee (SEATAC). In addition to the mitigation measures proposed by Envicom, SEATAC recommended that no parking be allowed along the adjoining streets and that on-site parking be limited to the movie set area, within the area that is fenced, and the applicant accepted this recommendation at the SEATAC meeting on September 15, 2014. These mitigation measures will be included as conditions of the CUP.

b) Have a substantial adverse effect on any sensitive natural communities (e.g., riparian habitat, coastal sage scrub, oak woodlands, non-jurisdictional wetlands) identified in local or regional plans, policies, regulations or by CDFW (formerly CDFG) or USFWS?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The entire parcel is in a Significant Ecological Area (SEA). The Big Rock Wash SEA covers nearly the entire parcel. A small triangular area in the northeast corner of the subject property is within the Lovejoy Butte SEA. This triangle measures approximately 15 feet from east to west and 20 feet from north to south, for an area of approximately 150 square feet. The developed area where the movie set is located is 0.7 acres in size, is located at the southeast corner at the intersection of Avenue Q and 145th Street East, and has been cleared of most vegetation. Joshua tree woodland habitat covers over 81% of the parcel, with 5.1 acres of the total 6.15 acres. Big Rock Wash is a normally dry watercourse that occasionally carries water in a northwesterly direction and includes a small area at the southwest corner of the parcel. A sand berm or levee was constructed for flood control purposes recently. The sparsely vegetated river wash and sand levee cover only about 0.07 acres of the subject parcel. An unpaved road and trail and surrounding disturbed area cover 0.28 acres in the northern part of the subject parcel. These disturbances were visible in aerial photographs in Envicom's 1999 BCA report, although it is unknown when the disturbances occurred. This area of the property is not used by the applicant and no activity is proposed for this area. No new construction, vegetation clearance, grading, or other development activities are proposed on the property. The applicant proposes only to continue the existing movie set and filming use within the disturbed movie set area and will confine all activity to this area. The impacts of the ongoing movie set activities will be less than significant with implementation of the mitigation measures discussed in the previous section as project conditions.

c) Have a substantial adverse effect on federally or state protected wetlands (including, but not limited to, marshes, vernal pools, coastal wetlands, and drainages) or waters of the United States, as defined by § 404 of the federal Clean Water Act or California Fish & Game code § 1600, et seq. through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

means?

Big Rock Wash flows through the property at the southwest corner of the parcel. No activity is proposed in the vicinity of the wash. The filming activity will have no impact on the wash. There are no other jurisdictional wetlands or waters on the parcel.

d) Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites?

☐☒☐☐

The movie set will not substantially interfere with the movement of migratory fish or wildlife. No aquatic habitat exists on the property or immediate vicinity other than Big Rock Wash, which is normally dry, but which contains aquatic habitat when water is present. The wash is protected by a large levee and will not be significantly impacted by any activity conducted on the property. Filming and other activities shall be prohibited outside of the movie set area and will therefore not interfere with the wash or with the Joshua tree woodland or other areas of migratory wildlife. Implementation of the project mitigation measures presented and accepted at the September 15, 2014 SEATAC meeting will minimize potential impacts to any migratory wildlife passing through the subject property to levels that are less than significant.

e) Convert oak woodlands (as defined by the state, oak woodlands are oak stands with greater than 10% canopy cover with oaks at least 5 inch in diameter measured at 4.5 feet above mean natural grade) or otherwise contain oak or other unique native trees (junipers, Joshuas, southern California black walnut, etc.)?

☐☐☒☐

There are no oak trees on the property according to the Environmental Assessment form and no oaks were identified in the BCA. The property contains a large number of Joshua trees, but none will be removed as a result of the project, and there will be no loss of Joshua tree woodland habitat. There was reportedly one Joshua tree removed in approximately 1998 when the movie set was established. The BCA mentions historical aerial images of the subject property from 1995 and 1997, prior to the construction of the movie set. The southeast corner area where the movie set is now located was already highly disturbed, but in part was naturally vegetated, which is consistent with the applicant's description of the site at that time. No conversion of woodland areas to other uses is proposed for this project.

f) Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, including Wildflower Reserve Areas (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.36), the Los Angeles County Oak Tree Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.56, Part 16), the Significant Ecological Areas (SEAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215), and Sensitive Environmental Resource Areas (SERAs) (L.A. County Code, Title 22, Ch. 22.44, Part 6)?

☐☐☒☐

The project will comply with the local policies and ordinances protecting biological resources, including the SEA ordinance. The subject property is within two SEAs, primarily the Big Rock Wash SEA and with a small

corner within the Lovejoy Butte SEA. The project was presented at the SEATAC meeting on September 15, 2014 and was approved subject to conditions. The use will be conducted in a manner that respects and protects the sensitive biological resources on the subject property and the surrounding area. The project shall be consistent with all applicable ordinances and policies.

g) Conflict with the provisions of an adopted state, regional, or local habitat conservation plan?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The subject property is within two SEAs, primarily the Big Rock Wash SEA and with a small corner within the Lovejoy Butte SEA. The project is designed to be consistent with the SEA requirements and does not conflict with those requirements, or of any other adopted local habitat conservation plan.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Would the project:

	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
--	--------------------------------------	---	------------------------------------	--------------

a) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

There are no known historic resources on the subject property. There are no historic resources on the property that are on the list of historic resources and points of interest designated by the State of California within unincorporated Los Angeles County, and there are no known historic resources on the property that meet the criteria in the CEQA historic resource eligibility criteria. The only structures on the property are the movie set structures constructed in or about 1998.

b) Cause a substantial adverse change in the significance of an archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines § 15064.5?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

There are no known archeological resources on the property. However, the potential still exists for unknown resources to exist on the site. Such resources could exist in the undisturbed area of the site or below the ground. No excavation, grading or vegetation clearance is proposed and no filming activity is to occur in the areas outside the existing movie set. Therefore, no substantial adverse change to any potential archaeological resources is likely to occur.

c) Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature, or contain rock formations indicating

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

potential paleontological resources?

There are no known paleontological resources on the property. No rock outcroppings indicating such resources have been observed, although a thorough search for such formations was not conducted. The potential still exists for unknown resources to exist on the site. Such resources could exist in the undisturbed area of the site or below the ground. No excavation, grading or vegetation clearance is proposed and no filming activity is to occur in the areas outside the existing movie set. Therefore, no substantial adverse change to any potential paleontological resources is likely to occur.

d) Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries?

☐☐☒☐

The property is not known or suspected to have ever been used as a cemetery or to contain human remains. However, the potential still exists for unknown human remains to exist on the site. Such resources could exist in the undisturbed area of the site or below the ground. No excavation, grading or vegetation clearance is proposed and no filming activity is to occur in the areas outside the existing movie set. Therefore, no disturbance of any human remains is likely to occur.

6. ENERGY

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Conflict with Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance (L.A. County Code Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 20 and Title 21, § 21.24.440) or Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 21, § 21.24.430 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52, Part 21)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The Los Angeles County Green Building Ordinance and Drought Tolerant Landscaping Ordinance are expected to be removed from the Zoning Code in the near future due to conflicts with similar state requirements and are expected to no longer be in effect by the time the project approval would potentially be finalized. The state requirements with regard to green building and drought tolerant landscaping may still be applicable to the project. No landscaping is proposed, and the site is to remain in a natural desert state, with no irrigation provided.

b) Involve the inefficient use of energy resources (see Appendix F of the CEQA Guidelines)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

There is currently no electricity available at the property from a utility company. Power is provided by a generator. All clients bring their own generators for electricity. The property may be hooked up to the electric grid at a future time, but electricity use will remain minimal, and would be for such things as an alarm system, security lights using a motion detector, and electric power for small film shoots. Energy resources are not expected to be used inefficiently or wastefully at this location and electrical usage will remain low.

7. GEOLOGY AND SOILS

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Expose people or structures to potential substantial adverse effects, including the risk of loss, injury, or death involving:

i) Rupture of a known earthquake fault, as delineated on the most recent Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zoning Map issued by the State Geologist for the area or based on other substantial evidence of a known active fault trace? Refer to Division of Mines and Geology Special Publication 42.

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No Alquist-Priolo Earthquake Fault Zone or active fault is located on the property or in the vicinity, based on the California Geological Survey map from 2004 for the Lovejoy Buttes quadrangle. The nearest mapped fault zone is nearly six miles away to the southwest in the community of Pearblossom.

ii) Strong seismic ground shaking?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The entire subject property is in a liquefaction zone according to the California Department of Conservation Seismic Hazards map layers in the GIS-Net 3 mapping application based on the latest available maps from the California Geological Survey. There is a potential for strong seismic ground shaking. However, it is not believed to be a high risk due to the fact that the structures are non-habitable and are only one story. The structures will be required to obtain a building permit and comply with the applicable Building and Safety requirements to verify the safety of the structures. A geotechnical report was prepared by ABI Consultants, Inc. dated February 26, 2015 based on a site investigation. The report notes that it is in a mapped liquefaction zone and that it is subject to strong seismic shaking, although there are no known active faults on or projecting toward the site.

iii) Seismic-related ground failure, including liquefaction and lateral spreading?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The entire subject property is in a liquefaction zone according to the California Department of Conservation Seismic Hazards map layers in the GIS-Net 3 mapping application based on the latest available maps from the California Geological Survey. The ABI report states that the site is underlain by alluvium consisting of dense to very dense silty sand. Accordingly, it concludes that the liquefaction potential of the site is low.

iv) Landslides?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The subject property is not located within a landslide zone according to the GIS-Net 3 mapping application. The nearest mapped landslide zone is nearly 2/3 of a mile to the northeast in the area of Lovejoy Buttes.

b) Result in substantial soil erosion or the loss of topsoil?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No grading, vegetation removal, construction, or other development is proposed. No erosion of topsoil will result from the project.

c) Be located on a geologic unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on- or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction or collapse?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The movie set is in a liquefaction zone, so it is potentially unstable. It is not in a landslide zone. However, the geotechnical report has found that liquefaction potential at the site is low due to the dense to very dense underlying alluvium.

d) Be located on expansive soil, as defined in Table 18-1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The geotechnical report found that the soil at the site consists of non-plastic granular soils and that the spoil is not expansive.

e) Have soils incapable of adequately supporting the use of onsite wastewater treatment systems where sewers are not available for the disposal of wastewater?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No onsite wastewater treatment system is proposed. A portable toilet is located at the site for sanitation. Waste is taken off site for disposal.

f) Conflict with the Hillside Management Area Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 22, § 22.56.215) or hillside design standards in the County General Plan Conservation and Open Space Element?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The project is not subject to the hillside management ordinance because the site is flat. There are no slopes of 25 percent or greater in the vicinity of the movie set.

8. GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Generate greenhouse gas (GHGs) emissions, either directly or indirectly, that may have a significant impact on the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The emissions created in relation to the project are not significant with regard to GHGs, climate change or other aspects of the environment. The emissions levels are far below the AVAQMD significance thresholds. The AVAQMD significance threshold for GHGs is 100,000 tons per year or 548,000 pounds per day. The emissions generated by the project will be from vehicles to transport film crews and other workers to the site and any emissions created by generators or other equipment used for movie and film shoots. The number of vehicle trips generated by the project will be very low and other project related emissions will be less than significant.

b) Conflict with any applicable plan, policy, or regulation adopted for the purpose of reducing the emissions of greenhouse gases?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The proposal does not conflict with any applicable plan, policy or regulation related to greenhouse gases because it is a very small scale project and the filming activity will be conducted in accordance with all applicable regulations. The small scale of the project will not result in a significant increase in greenhouse gas emissions and is well below the established significance thresholds.

9. HAZARDS AND HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine transport, storage, production, use, or disposal of hazardous materials?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No hazardous materials are proposed to be used for the project. No hazardous materials are expected to be used or stored on the property except for substances such as gasoline and motor oil contained in vehicles visiting the site.

b) Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials or waste into the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project would not create conditions where there is a potential for the release of hazardous materials into the environment or that would pose a hazard to the public.

c) Emit hazardous emissions or handle hazardous or acutely hazardous materials, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of sensitive land uses?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No hazardous emissions will be produced on the site and no acutely hazardous materials are expected to be used on the property. Some hazardous substances such as gasoline may potentially be used, but any potential use of such materials is not expected to have a significant impact as long as they are not misused.

d) Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code § 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The property is not on the list of hazardous waste and substances sites (Cortese list) maintained by the California Department of Toxic Substances Control, and there are no such sites in the vicinity.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan, or where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The property is not located within an airport land use plan or within two miles of any airport.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No private airstrips are located in the vicinity.

g) Impair implementation of, or physically interfere with, an adopted emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposal would not impair implementation of an emergency response or evacuation plan or physically interfere with such a plan. It will need to obtain approval from the Los Angeles County Fire Department (Fire Department) to ensure that it will comply with emergency response and evacuation plans and other fire safety requirements.

h) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving fires, because the project is located:

i) within a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zones (Zone 4)? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The property is not in a Very High Fire Hazard Severity Zone.

ii) within a high fire hazard area with inadequate access? ☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

The property is not in a high fire hazard area and has adequate access.

iii) within an area with inadequate water and pressure to meet fire flow standards? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

A 5,000 gallon water tank is provided on the site for fire protection. The Fire Department has determined that this tank is adequate to provide water for fire protection of the site and has required the current 5,000 gallon tank to be maintained in a letter dated January 5, 2015.

iv) within proximity to land uses that have the potential for dangerous fire hazard? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No neighboring land uses are dangerous fire hazards. No refineries, flammables, explosives manufacturing or other dangerous fire hazards are located in the vicinity.

i) Does the proposed use constitute a potentially dangerous fire hazard? ☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The movie set use is not a dangerous fire hazard.

DRAFT

10. HYDROLOGY AND WATER QUALITY

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

A portable toilet is proposed for the site. No wastewater is discharged on the site. Wastewater is regularly collected and transported off site to a suitable location. The use does not violate any water quality standards or waste discharge requirements.

b) Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lowering of the local groundwater table level (e.g., the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There is no well on the property and no water company hookup. Very little water is used on the site, and the only water available is water that is brought onto the site by clients or visitors to the site or by the owner's water supplier. Annual water usage is estimated by the property owner at less than 300 gallons per year. Accounting for evaporation, the total annual water usage was estimated at 500 gallons. There is a 5,000 gallon water tank on the site for fire protection. The tank is topped off approximately twice per year to make up for water lost through evaporation or use. Small amounts of water are occasionally used for such things as mopping the interior linoleum floors and mixing paint, but otherwise water is seldom used on the site by the owner. Clients also use little water and bring their own water for drinking or occasionally small amounts for filming purposes. A portable waterless toilet is used on the site and serviced twice per week, so no water is needed for sanitation purposes. The subject property is part of the Antelope Valley Groundwater Adjudication Area. However, the water source used for the site originates from outside of the adjudication area. Water is currently supplied from a source in Oxnard, which is outside the adjudication area, and the owner has agreed to continue to only use water from outside the adjudication area and to require clients using the site to do likewise. Water has also been supplied from a source in Agua Dulce, which is also outside of the adjudication area. The CUP will be conditioned to require that all water used on the site be trucked in from outside of the Antelope Valley Basin Groundwater Adjudication Area. No groundwater is to be used on the site. Therefore, the project will have no impact to the groundwater levels at the site or within the Antelope Valley Groundwater Adjudication Area.

c) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, in a manner which would result in substantial erosion or siltation on- or off-site?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No grading, vegetation clearance, construction of new structures, or other activities are proposed that would

impact the drainage pattern of the site. A flood control levee or berm was constructed at the southwest corner of the site in recent years as part of a larger flood control system. The clearance of the vegetation and construction of the movie set which took place in or about 1998 has had some impact on the site drainage, although no further changes to site drainage shall occur based on the project.

d) Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area, including through the alteration of the course of a stream or river, or substantially increase the rate or amount of surface runoff in a manner which would result in flooding on- or off-site?

☐☐☒☐

No alterations are proposed to the drainage pattern of the site. The project is subject to the Low Impact Development (LID) requirements regarding drainage and all other applicable requirements regarding drainage. Applicability of LID requirements shall be determined by the Los Angeles County Department of Public Works (Public Works).

e) Add water features or create conditions in which standing water can accumulate that could increase habitat for mosquitoes and other vectors that transmit diseases such as the West Nile virus and result in increased pesticide use?

☐☐☒☐

No standing water pools or other features are proposed. Water may naturally pool in some locations on the property following rainfall, but the project does not add any potential sites for water to accumulate.

f) Create or contribute runoff water which would exceed the capacity of existing or planned stormwater drainage systems or provide substantial additional sources of polluted runoff?

☐☐☒☐

No new development is proposed, so there will not be an increase in the amount of runoff.

g) Generate construction or post-construction runoff that would violate applicable stormwater NPDES permits or otherwise significantly affect surface water or groundwater quality?

☐☐☒☐

No new development is proposed, so there will not be an increase in the amount of runoff. The project does not discharge any wastewater or result in pollution of water runoff.

h) Conflict with the Los Angeles County Low Impact Development Ordinance (L.A. County Code, Title 12, Ch. 12.84 and Title 22, Ch. 22.52)?

☐☐☐☒

LID requirements may apply to the project. LID requirements shall be determined by Public Works.

i) Result in point or nonpoint source pollutant

☐☐☒☐

discharges into State Water Resources Control Board-designated Areas of Special Biological Significance?

The property does not discharge into any designated Area of Special Biological Significance.

j) Use onsite wastewater treatment systems in areas with known geological limitations (e.g. high groundwater) or in close proximity to surface water (including, but not limited to, streams, lakes, and drainage course)?

☐ ☐ ☐ ☒

No onsite wastewater treatment system exists on the site and none is proposed.

k) Otherwise substantially degrade water quality?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project will not substantially degrade water quality. No new impacts are proposed.

l) Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard Boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map, or within a floodway or floodplain?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The entire property is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) flood zone according to the GIS-Net 3 FEMA flood zone map. However, this project does not involve housing. The flood control levee that was constructed along Big Rock Wash, which is partially on the subject property, appears adequate to protect the site from any major flood events that may occur.

m) Place structures, which would impede or redirect flood flows, within a 100-year flood hazard area, floodway, or floodplain?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

No structures are proposed, although the movie set structures are within a FEMA flood zone. The flood control levee along Big Rock Wash appears to provide adequate protection in case of a large flood event. Building and Safety division of Public Works shall verify the safety and adequacy of the structures with regard to flood hazards.

n) Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

There is no Dam Inundation Area on the subject property according to the GIS-Net3 map showing areas that have the potential to be flooded after a catastrophic failure of a dam.

o) Place structures in areas subject to inundation by seiche, tsunami, or mudflow?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The property is not in or close to any areas susceptible to inundation due to seiche, tsunami, or mudflow.

DRAFT

11. LAND USE AND PLANNING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Physically divide an established community?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The project would not create any barriers dividing the community. The existing movie set is one of only a few developed sites in the area. Most of the surrounding area is vacant desert land with some widely scattered residences. The movie set does not create a significant barrier to wildlife movement or any other barrier to the community.

b) Be inconsistent with the applicable County plans for the subject property including, but not limited to, the General Plan, specific plans, local coastal plans, area plans, and community/neighborhood plans?

☐ ☒ ☐ ☐

The movie set use is compatible with the newly adopted Antelope Valley Area Plan (Town & Country Plan) effective June 16, 2015, and the applicable Los Angeles County General Plan policies for the area. The current AV Plan designation is Rural Land 20, which is primarily for low density residential use of up to one dwelling unit per 20 acres, equestrian and animal uses, and agricultural uses. Other uses may be allowed where appropriate. The movie set use is also compatible with the old Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan (Old AV Plan). The Old AV Plan designation was Nonurban 1, which was primarily for low density residential use of up to 0.5 dwelling units per acre and agricultural uses. Non-residential uses were allowed in accordance with general guidelines listed in the AV Plan, including appropriate conditioning through a public hearing process. The project was also reviewed by SEATAC and found to be compatible with the SEA requirements, provided the recommended mitigation measures are implemented to avoid or mitigate potential impacts to the SEA.

c) Be inconsistent with the County zoning ordinance as applicable to the subject property?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The existing lot size is 6.15 acres, which is consistent with the current zoning (A-2-2, Heavy Agricultural, two acre minimum lot size). The zoning of the site changed from A-2-1 (Heavy Agricultural, one acre minimum lot size) to A-2-2 with the adoption of the 2015 Antelope Valley Area Plan, and became effective on July 16, 2015. It is a legal lot created by a Record of Survey (Lot 25 of RS 68-37) adopted by the Board of Supervisors on August 11, 1953. The A-2-2 zone allows motion picture studios with a Conditional Use Permit (CUP). It will therefore be considered to be consistent with the zoning ordinance requirements if the CUP is approved. The property is not in a Community Standards District.

d) Conflict with Hillside Management criteria, Significant Ecological Areas conformance criteria, or other applicable land use criteria?

☐ ☐ ☒ ☐

The proposal is not subject to the Hillside Management requirements of the Los Angeles County Zoning Code. The development site does not contain any hillsides exceeding slopes of 25%. It is in a Significant Ecological Area (SEA) and is subject to an SEA CUP. The project has been reviewed by SEATAC and was found to be consistent with the SEA compatibility criteria.

DRAFT

12. MINERAL RESOURCES

Would the project:	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Result in the loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

There are no known mineral resources on the project site and the project would not result in the loss or availability of any valuable mineral resources. It is not identified as a Mineral Resource Area on the Special Management Area map of the Los Angeles County General Plan.

b) Result in the loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The property is not designated as a mineral resource recovery site on any land use plan.

13. NOISE

<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project result in:

a) Exposure of persons to, or generation of, noise levels in excess of standards established in the County General Plan or noise ordinance (Los Angeles County Code, Title 12, Chapter 12.08), or applicable standards of other agencies?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The project will not result in excess noise. Some noise from filming will inevitably occur, but filming companies using the site will be provided educational materials on the sensitive nature of the site and shall be required to minimize noise impacts as much as possible. The County noise standards shall be applicable and it is required that the use shall remain in compliance. The requirement to comply with the County noise ordinance will be included as a condition of the CUP

b) Exposure of persons to or generation of excessive groundborne vibration or groundborne noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Some groundborne vibration or related noise could potentially occur as a result of some filming activities, although it is not expected to occur or be excessive.

c) A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from parking areas?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Noise levels will remain at current levels. The movie set use has operated since 1998 and the noise impacts are expected to remain the same as they have been. There will not be a substantial permanent increase in noise levels.

d) A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project, including noise from amplified sound systems?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Noise levels may be temporarily higher for some film shoots, but noise would be required to be kept within the levels allowed by the County Noise Control ordinance.

e) For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

There is no airport in the area and it is not part of an airport land use plan.

f) For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels?

☐☐☐☒

There is no private airstrip in the area.

DRAFT

14. POPULATION AND HOUSING

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (for example, by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (for example, through extension of roads or other infrastructure)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

No new homes or businesses are proposed. The existing movie set business, which has operated at this location since 1998, will not result in a substantial increase in the population of the area. There will be no new roads or other infrastructure that would induce further growth.

b) Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, especially affordable housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No housing will be displaced as a result of the project.

c) Displace substantial numbers of people, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

No people will be displaced by this project.

d) Cumulatively exceed official regional or local population projections?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
---	--------------------------	--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------

The project would not cause the regional or local population projections to be exceeded and will have no impact on population growth. No zone change or plan amendment is being requested to allow higher density than currently allowed.

15. PUBLIC SERVICES

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
a) Would the project create capacity or service level problems, or result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental facilities in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services:				
Fire protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>There is an existing fire station approximately four miles from the subject property (Fire Station 114) in Lake Los Angeles. Fire protection service will remain at an acceptable level.</u>				
Sheriff protection?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>The continued use of the existing movie set is not anticipated to have any significant effect on the level of Sheriff protection in the area.</u>				
Schools?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>The movie set use will not have an effect on local school service capacity.</u>				
Parks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>The movie set use will not have an effect on local parks capacity.</u>				
Libraries?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<u>The movie set use will not have an effect on area libraries.</u>				
Other public facilities?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>The continued operation of the movie set use is not expected to have a significant effect on other public facilities in the area.</u>				

16. RECREATION

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact with
Mitigation
Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|--|---|--|---|-------------------------------------|
| a) Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

The project would not increase the use of neighborhood or regional parks and would not result in substantial physical deterioration of parks or other recreational facilities. No new residences or uses are proposed.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b) Does the project include neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of such facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

No new recreation facilities are proposed as part of this project. Existing recreation facilities will not need to be expanded as a result of the project.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c) Would the project interfere with regional open space connectivity? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

Open space connectivity will not be affected. No expansion of the movie set use is proposed.

17. TRANSPORTATION/TRAFFIC

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
Would the project:				
a) Conflict with an applicable plan, ordinance, or policy establishing measures of effectiveness for the performance of the circulation system, taking into account all modes of transportation including mass transit and non-motorized travel and relevant components of the circulation system, including but not limited to intersections, streets, highways and freeways, pedestrian and bicycle paths, and mass transit?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>The existing movie set is at the corner of two local streets with very little traffic. No mass transit is available in the area. Film companies frequently use private buses and other forms of shared transportation to minimize the number of vehicle trips needed to travel to the site. The property contains adequate room for parking in the area of the movie set. Parking will be prohibited along the streets beyond the movie set at the southeast corner. The number of vehicle trips generated by the movie set use will remain very low and will have a negligible impact on the traffic circulation system.</u></p>				
b) Conflict with an applicable congestion management program (CMP), including, but not limited to, level of service standards and travel demand measures, or other standards established by the CMP for designated roads or highways?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>No change in traffic levels is anticipated. The continued operation of the movie set will not significantly affect the level of service of existing roads in the area and traffic levels will remain low.</u></p>				
c) Result in a change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>The project will not change air traffic patterns, will not increase air traffic levels in any significant way and will not create any changes that would result in substantial air safety risks. There are no airports in the immediate area or any landmarks on the property used for aviation that would be affected. No impact to air traffic patterns would result from the project.</u></p>				
d) Substantially increase hazards due to a design feature (e.g., sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The movie set use will not result in increased hazards.

e) Result in inadequate emergency access?

☐☐☒☐

Adequate emergency access shall be maintained, including unobstructed vehicular access to within 150 feet of all portions of the exterior walls of the building.

f) Conflict with adopted policies, plans, or programs regarding public transit, bicycle, or pedestrian facilities, or otherwise decrease the performance or safety of such facilities?

☐☐☒☐

There are no bicycle routes or public transit routes in the vicinity. The project will not conflict with any plans, policies or standards regarding pedestrians, bicycles and alternate transportation modes.

18. UTILITIES AND SERVICE SYSTEMS

	<i>Potentially Significant Impact</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact with Mitigation Incorporated</i>	<i>Less Than Significant Impact</i>	<i>No Impact</i>
--	---	--	---	----------------------

Would the project:

a) Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of either the Los Angeles or Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Boards?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

The movie set uses a portable toilet that will be required to comply with all applicable requirements. No waste is discharged on the site and waste is regularly collected and transported off site.

b) Create water or wastewater system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

No wastewater treatment facilities will be required for the project as the project is a small scale use with low levels of waste generated. No capacity problems are anticipated.

c) Create drainage system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Any necessary drainage improvements will be on-site and will not cause significant environmental effects or off-site impacts.

d) Have sufficient reliable water supplies available to serve the project demands from existing entitlements and resources, considering existing and projected water demands from other land uses?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Water use by the movie set is very low and is brought in by clients as needed. There is no water supply available on the property other than a 5,000 gallon water tank used for fire protection. No increase in water demand is anticipated. The existing water supply is adequate for the use.

e) Create energy utility (electricity, natural gas, propane) system capacity problems, or result in the construction of new energy facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects?

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
--------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

Energy use on the site is not anticipated to create any capacity problems or create the need for expansion of existing facilities. Currently there is no electricity available at the movie set. Power is provided by a generator and clients bring their own generators as needed. The owner may in the future connect the property to the power lines in the area to obtain power for security alarms, security lighting with motion detectors, electric tools, lights for small film shoots, and other needs. However, power use on the property would still remain low and would not result in capacity problems or significant environmental effects.

f) Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs?

☐☐☒☐

The solid waste disposal needs of the site are not anticipated to create capacity problems for area landfills because waste generated by the project will remain low and there are no known capacity problems at area landfills. The property has been used as an illegal dump site by unknown persons, a problem which is very common in the area due to people who don't want to pay for proper waste disposal. The property owner regularly cleans up the property to properly dispose of waste and is trying to keep the property clean and ecologically healthy. This helps the area to remain a desirable area as a film location and to maintain a healthy community and environment. The property is required to comply with all applicable codes and requirements regarding solid waste disposal.

g) Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste?

☐☐☒☐

Regulations relating to solid waste disposal must be complied with. The project shall be required to comply with all applicable requirements for solid waste disposal.

19. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE

- | | <i>Potentially
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact with
Mitigation
Incorporated</i> | <i>Less Than
Significant
Impact</i> | <i>No
Impact</i> |
|--|---|--|---|--------------------------|
| a) Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment, substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number or restrict the range of a rare or endangered plant or animal or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The existing movie set shall have mitigation measures to minimize the effects on the SEA incorporated into the CUP. The project shall incorporate SEATAC recommendations to reduce potential effects on the environment. No sensitive plant or animal communities are threatened by the proposal. Recommendations from the consulting biologist and staff biologist shall be followed to ensure that plant and animal communities are protected. There are no known historical or cultural resources on the property.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| b) Does the project have the potential to achieve short-term environmental goals to the disadvantage of long-term environmental goals? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

No significant environmental impacts are anticipated for the project in either the short-term or the long-term with the incorporation of mitigation measures.

- | | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| c) Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable?
("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

Incremental effects of the project are not significant and it does not create a cumulatively significant impact. The development of this project as proposed does not make it easier to develop other properties in the area. No infrastructure will be added. This project will not significantly alter the character of the area or create any cumulatively significant impact. The amount of potential emissions resulting from the project will be less than significant and the project would not result in cumulative air quality impacts or any other significant cumulative impacts. There are no other current projects in the area and development of this project is not expected to lead to any new development, nor does it make it easier to develop other properties.

- | | | | | |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| d) Does the project have environmental effects which | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|

will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?

No substantial adverse effects will be caused by the proposal, either directly or indirectly. The existing movie set is compatible with the area and will not alter the existing neighborhood pattern significantly or negatively impact human health.

Reference Source List:

Anderson, Jim, Senior Biologist, Envicom Corporation, Biological Constraints Analysis Four Aces Movie Location Property, October 30, 2014

Baguio, Ramon, RB Plan Design, The Four Aces site plan, October 22, 2014 (updated May 7, 2015), The Four Aces floor plan and elevation plan, February 1, 2014

Bettadapura, Daya, MS, PE, Principal Engineer, ABI Engineering Consultants, Inc., Preliminary Geotechnical Investigation Report for Four Aces Movie Set Site, February 26, 2015

California Department of Conservation, California Geological Survey, Lovejoy Buttes Quadrangle Seismic Hazard Zones map, April 19, 2004

California Department of Conservation, Division of Land Resource Protection, Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program, Los Angeles County Important Farmland 2012 map, January, 2015

Glidden, Brian D., LS, Arrow Engineering Services, Inc., The Four Aces As-Built Survey, August 28, 2014

Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, Antelope Valley Areawide General Plan, adopted December 4, 1986

Los Angeles County, Department of Regional Planning, County of Los Angeles General Plan, adopted November 25, 1980

Los Angeles County, Directory of Properties in the Historical Property Data File, Volumes I through IV, May 3, 2005

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)
PROJECT NO. R2014-00920 / PERMIT NO. RCUP 201400043 / ENV NO. RENV 201400085

#	Environmental Factor	Mitigation	Action Required	When Monitoring to Occur	Responsible Agency or Party	Monitoring Agency or Party
4.1	Biological Resources	<p>Protective Fencing and Signage: Maintain a permanent fence along the northern and western boundaries of the developed/disturbed area containing the movie set in order to prevent and discourage encroachment into adjacent sensitive habitats. Permanent signage shall be posted at the perimeter of the developed site to inform personnel of the sensitive status of the Joshua tree woodland and Big Rock Wash, as well as the presence of the Big Rock Wash Significant Ecological Area. Signage must also prohibit access by domestic pets with or without leashes in the sensitive habitats.</p>	<p>Prior to approval of the Exhibit A for the CUP, the Applicant must submit a plan for the design and installation of the required fencing and signage to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP) for review and approval. At the discretion of the LACDRP, the existing barbed wire fencing at the site may be considered adequate to prevent and discourage encroachment. LACDRP shall conduct site inspections to ensure that appropriate fencing has been installed and that the permanent signage has been posted. The installation of the required fencing and signage must be completed before issuance of the approval of the Exhibit A for the CUP.</p>	After approval of the CUP (ongoing)	Applicant and consulting biologist	Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP)

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)
PROJECT NO. R2014-00920 / PERMIT NO. RCUP 201400043 / ENV NO. RENV 201400085

4.2	Biological Resources	<p>Trash Disposal: All food-related trash shall be disposed of in predator-proof closed containers. Permanent signage shall be posted to remind personnel to dispose of food-related trash in predator-proof closed containers. LACDRP shall conduct site inspections to ensure that the permanent signage has been posted.</p>	Post required signage and properly dispose of trash.	After approval of the CUP (ongoing)	Applicant	Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP)
4.3	Biological Resources	<p>Environmental Education Handout: The Applicant shall prepare and submit an environmental education handout to LACDRP for review and approval. The environmental education handout shall address, at a minimum, the following topics: the presence and environmental significance of the Big Rock Wash Significant Ecological Area; the sensitive status of the native habitats surrounding the project site; the potential adverse effects of encroachment of personnel, vehicles, and pets into sensitive habitats; the potential adverse effects of light trespass, glare, and excessive noise during nighttime hours on wildlife and on wildlife movement; and, any permit conditions and mitigation measures required to avoid and reduce potential adverse effects on sensitive habitats, special-status wildlife, and wildlife movement.</p>	<p>The environmental education materials shall be distributed to all lessees and key personnel managing the site. Upon receipt of the environmental education materials, all lessees and key personnel shall indicate by signature that they have received and understand the environmental education materials. The Applicant shall maintain the signatures on file to be provided at the request of the LACDRP.</p>	<p>Prior to issuance of the Exhibit A for the CUP obtain approval of handout from LACDRP. Ongoing monitoring after approval of CUP by LACDRP.</p>	Applicant and consulting biologist	Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP)

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM (MMRP)
PROJECT NO. R2014-00920 / PERMIT NO. RCUP 201400043 / ENV NO. RENV 201400085

4.4	Biological Resources	<p>Parking Restriction: Parking shall be restricted to the fenced-off developed area at the southeastern part of the property, and shall be prohibited in all off-site areas in the vicinity of the film set, including road shoulders. If the fenced-off developed area cannot accommodate the parking needs of the project, parking shall be at a remote off-site location. If a remote off-site location is to be used, the Applicant must submit the location of the off-site parking area to the Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP) for review and approval.</p>	Minimize night lighting	After approval of the CUP (ongoing)	Applicant	Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP)
19	Mitigation Compliance	<p>Deposit: As a means of ensuring compliance of above mitigation measures, the applicant and subsequent owner(s) are responsible for submitting compliance reports to the Department of Regional Planning for review upon request, and for replenishing the mitigation monitoring account if necessary until all mitigation measures have been implemented and completed. A deposit of \$6,000 for mitigation monitoring must be paid to the Department of Regional Planning within 60 days of the approval the CUP Exhibit A. Any unused funds in the account after the MMRP monitoring is completed will be refunded to the payer upon request.</p>	<p>Submittal and approval of compliance report, payment of mitigation monitoring deposit, and replenishing mitigation monitoring account</p>	Yearly and as required until all measures are completed.	Applicant	Los Angeles County Department of Regional Planning (LACDRP)

MITIGATION MONITORING AND REPORTING PROGRAM
PROJECT NO. R2014-00920 / CUP NO. 201400043 / ENV NO. 201400085

The Department of Regional Planning staff has determined that the attached mitigation measures for the project are necessary in order to assure that the proposed project will not cause significant impacts on the environment.

The permittee shall deposit the sum of \$6,000.00 with the Department of Regional Planning within 30 days of permit approval in order to defray the cost of reviewing and verifying the information contained in the reports required by the Mitigation Monitoring and Reporting Program.

As the applicant, I agree to incorporate these mitigation measures into the project, and understand that the public hearing and consideration by the Hearing Officer and/or Regional Planning Commission will be on the project as mitigation measures.

Alach
Applicant

5-18-2015
Date

Rebecca V. [Signature]
Staff

10-22-15
Date

RECEIVED
MAY 27 2015
BY: _____